

Claim 27 depends from claim 26 and further characterizes the structure as having a removable liner as per the description at page 8.

Claim 28 depends from claim 26 and further characterizes the removable liner as being of smaller height and width than the sheet of paper as per Fig. 5.

Claim 29 recites a structure as shown in Fig. 5 and described at page 8, lines 4 to 6 without a liner.

Claim 30 contains recitations as in allowed claim 1 except for the inclusion of liners and adhesive. Fig. 1 illustrates a structure as recited in claim 30. The description at page 1, recites "In one embodiment, the invention provides a blank that is comprised of a sheet of paper having at least two areas each of which has a removable section for receiving imaging on a front surface." A further description of Fig. 1 appears in page 4, line 1 to page 5, line 2. Claim 30 is believed to be allowable for the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 31 depends from claim 30 and includes an adhesive on each of the main subsections. The description at page 1, line 17 *et seq* teaches that a layer of adhesive is disposed on at least one of the sections for laminating the two removable sections to each other in back-to-back relation when the sheet of paper is folded on itself to bring the two sections into registration over each other.

The description at page 1 also states " Further, a removable liner is disposed over the adhesive to prevent inadvertent adhesion to another substrate and to protect the adhesive until use is to be made thereof." This is a teaching to one skilled in the art that in cases where inadvertent adhesion of the adhesive to another substrate is not of concern, a removable liner is not required. For example, use may be made of a

removable pressure sensitive adhesive which can be peeled off, together with the backing to which it is applied, from a substrate surface without damage to either the adhesive or the substrate. U.S. Pat. Nos. 5,035,518; 4,645,711; 4,599,265; 4,629,663; 3,608,707; 3,922,464; 4,902,142; and 4,709,399, describe pressure sensitive adhesives and/or packaging using pressure sensitive adhesives. Also, the adhesive may be formed from coadhesives, as known in the art, that will only adhere to like coadhesives. A cold sealable, pressure-sensitive cohesive is described in U.S. Pat. No. 4,898,787. This cohesive has low surface tack and is cohesive only when placed under pressure in contact with other cold sealable cohesive coated surfaces. See also, U.S. Pat. No. 6,467,957 and U.S. Pat. No. 5,967,321.

Claim 31 depends from claim 30 and is believed to be allowable for similar reasons.

Claim 32 contains recitations as in claim 6 except for the inclusion of liners. Figs. 1 and 3 illustrate a structure as recited in claim 32. The structure is described in page 1, as noted above, and at page 2, i.e. "Typically, the imaging applied to each area of the blank is different from and related to the imaging applied to the other of the areas. For example, for a trading card, a photo of an individual may be imaged in one area and statistical information regarding the individual may be imaged on the other area. In similar fashion, an image of a person or animal may be imaged on one area while a closeup photo of the person or animal is imaged on the other area."

Claim 32 is believed to be allowable for the same reasons as claim 4 as expressed in the Amendment filed June 25, 2007.


Claim 33 depends from claim 32. Figs. 1 and 3 illustrate a structure as recited in claim 33. See also page 6, line 5 for the description of a "window". Claim 33 is believed to be allowable for similar reasons as claim 32.

Of note, the undersigned could not find MPEP 2163.06 II(A) in the current PTO web site edition of the MPEP.

Under MPEP 2163.04, the description as filed is presumed to be adequate, unless or until sufficient evidence or reasoning to the contrary has been presented by the examiner to rebut the presumption. See, e.g., *In re Marzocchi*, 439 F.2d 220, 224, 169 USPQ 367, 370 (CCPA 1971). The examiner, therefore, must have a reasonable basis to challenge the adequacy of the written description. The examiner has the initial burden of presenting by a preponderance of evidence why a person skilled in the art would not recognize in an applicant's disclosure a description of the invention defined by the claims. *Wertheim*, 541 F.2d at 263, 191 USPQ at 97.

The application is believed to be in condition for an allowance and such is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Francis C. Hand
Reg. No. 22,280

CARELLA, BYRNE BAIN, GILFILLAN,
CECCHI, STEWART & OLSTEIN
5 Becker Farm Road
Roseland, NJ 07068
Phone: 973-994-1700
Fax: 973-994-1744

#326588